

PROJECT NAME:	North Fork Aspen Regen 2
DATE:	May 28, 2019
DISTRICT:	Nez Perce-Clearwater NF, North Fork Ranger District

CONSIDERATION OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES

EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES	PRESENT? (YES/NO)	MAJOR EFFECT? (YES/NO)	INFORMATION OR MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT
A1. Threatened , endangered, & sensitive species or their habitats - WILDLIFE	Yes	No	N/A
A2. Threatened , endangered, & sensitive species or their habitats - FISHERIES			
A3. Threatened , endangered, & sensitive species or their habitats - PLANTS			
B. Floodplains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds			
C. Congressionally designated areas such as wilderness or National Recreation Areas			
D. Roadless areas			
E. Research Natural Areas			
F. Native American religious or cultural sites, archeological sites, or historic properties or areas			

Projects in Roadless Areas

Project impacts on roadless characteristics as defined in 36 CFR 294(B)11 & (C)21

Roadless Characteristics	Present? (YES/NO)	INFORMATION OR MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT
1. High quality or undisturbed soil, water and air.		
2. Sources of public drinking water		
3. Diversity of plant and animal communities	Yes	It is expected that the project will increase habitat diversity by rejuvenating encroached aspen stands.
4. Habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate and sensitive species and for those species dependant on large undisturbed areas or land	Yes	<p>Canada Lynx: Some of the proposed units fall within an LAU and incorporate lynx habitat. Projects of this nature are addressed within the 2014 Programmatic Biological Assessment for activities that are not likely to adversely affect Canada lynx, grizzly bear, and Canada lynx Critical Habitat. The Biological Screening Criteria under Table B2 includes Habitat Restoration Activities (including aspen rejuvenation) as long as NRLMD standards and guidelines are met within the respective LAU. The LAU in question does not exceed 30% stand initiation structural stage and does not exceed 15% regeneration harvest in the last 10 years. Additionally, there is no pre-commercial thinning or harvest with multi-story proposed. Therefore the project meets NRLMD Standards and Guidelines.</p> <p>North American Wolverine: Units fall within one or both models of wolverine habitat. Projects of this nature are addressed under the 2014 Programmatic Biological Assessment for North American Wolverine. Within this Programmatic Habitat Maintenance and restoration activities including "...meadow and/or aspen stand maintenance and Restoration.." is determined to not be a threat to the continued existence of the Northern Rockies Distinct Population Segment of North American Wolverine.</p>
5. Primitive, semi-private nonmotorized and semi-primitive motorized classes of dispersed recreation		
6. Reference landscapes		
7. Natural appearing landscapes with high scenic quality		
8. Traditional cultural properties and sacred sites		
9. Other locally identified unique characteristics		

Projects involving Road Construction, Reconstruction, Temporary Roads, and/or Haul Routes

ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS	YES/NO	MITIGATION MEASURE/COMMENTS/INFO
1. Will road construction or reconstruction be required? Type of road and length.		
2. Will temporary roads be needed?		
3. Will road maintenance be needed? Who will perform?		
4. Is the area in a travel plan closure area? Year round or seasonal? Hunting season restrictions?	N/A	No Road Construction Proposed
5. Are haul roads part of an established snowmobile network?		
6. Are there public safety concerns for roads, trails, or other road improvements?		
7. Are there other improvements which will require protection?		
8. Will the project impact winter range?	N/A	No Road Construction Proposed
9. Will the project impact critical elk summer range or cause elk summer habitat effectiveness to be below FP standards?	N/A	No Road Construction Proposed
10. Will the project impact elk security?	N/A	No Road Construction Proposed

Projects involving Vegetation/Fuels Treatment

RESOURCE CONSIDERATION	YES/NO	MITIGATION/EXPLANATION
1. Will post-treatment stands meet R1 down woody debris requirements?	Yes	Project does not propose to reduce down woody debris.
2. Will post-treatment stands meet snag and replacement snag guidelines?	Yes	Project proposes to cut or girdle competing conifers. Girdled trees will eventually provide snag habitat.
3. Are activities proposed in PACFISH/INFISH RHCA or wetland?		
4. Is the area in a PACFISH/INFISH priority watershed? Is the stream fish bearing?		
5. Are there soil compaction concerns? i.e. Does the proposal involve ground based heavy equipment?		
6. Is the area in an active grazing allotment? What type of livestock? How many?		
7. Does the area meet FP standards for elk habitat effectiveness?	Yes	Forest Plan Standards for EHE in all but one of the EAAs is 25%. Forest Plan Standard within the Ruble EAA is 75%. All EAAs meet or exceed Forest Plan Standards for EHE and project related activities will not reduce EHE.
8. Is the area in a visually sensitive area? Will mitigation measures be needed to reduce adverse visual effects?		
9. What other entities or agencies need to be contacted for coordination.		
10. Are there land line survey needs?		
11. What noxious weed control measures will be employed?		
12. Are activities proposed in old growth or replacement old growth?	No	